

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/608,085	HWANG ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Tarifur R. Chowdhury	2871	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Tarifur R. Chowdhury.

(3) Mr. Eric Nuss.

(2) Ms. Jean DiGrazio.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 12 October 2006.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1 and 17.

Identification of prior art discussed: USPAT 6,043,511 (Kim) and US 2002/0117691 (Choi).


Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


 TARIFUR R. CHOWDHURY
 PRIMARY EXAMINER

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant's representative presented argument as to why Choi is not combinable with Kim specially pointing out that in Choi the sequence of the double layers are opposite to what is claimed and thus would not be combinable with Kim. Even though for the gate line and gate electrode the examiner is not convinced with applicant's representative argument the examiner agreed with applicant's representative that one of ordinary skill in the art would probably not look into Choi for the source and drain electrodes to have double layers wherein the copper layer being the top layer. However, applicant's representative was notified that further consideration and/or search would be needed to define patentability.